

CIVIL COVER SHEET

The JS 44 civil cover sheet and the information contained herein neither replace nor supplement the filing and service of pleadings or other papers as required by law, except as provided by local rules of court. This form, approved by the Judicial Conference of the United States in September 1974, is required for the use of the Clerk of Court for the purpose of initiating the civil docket sheet. (SEE INSTRUCTIONS ON NEXT PAGE OF THIS FORM.)

I. (a) PLAINTIFFS

JOHN MAHONEY, on behalf of himself and all others
similarly situated

(b) County of Residence of First Listed Plaintiff Bucks County
(EXCEPT IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES)

(c) Attorneys (Firm Name, Address, and Telephone Number)

David S. Glanzberg, Esq./Robert M. Tobia, Esq.
123 S. Broad St., Ste 1640, Phila, PA 19109

DEFENDANTS

FOOT LOCKER STORES, INC.

County of Residence of First Listed Defendant

(IN U.S. PLAINTIFF CASES ONLY)

NOTE: IN LAND CONDEMNATION CASES, USE THE LOCATION OF
THE TRACT OF LAND INVOLVED.

Attorneys (If Known)

II. BASIS OF JURISDICTION (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☐ 1 U.S. Government Plaintiff
- ☒ 3 Federal Question (U.S. Government Not a Party)
- ☐ 2 U.S. Government Defendant
- ☐ 4 Diversity (Indicate Citizenship of Parties in Item III)

III. CITIZENSHIP OF PRINCIPAL PARTIES (Place an "X" in One Box for Plaintiff and One Box for Defendant)

- | | PTF | DEF | | PTF | DEF |
|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|---|----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Citizen of This State | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 | Incorporated or Principal Place of Business In This State | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 | <input type="checkbox"/> 4 |
| Citizen of Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> 2 | Incorporated and Principal Place of Business In Another State | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 | <input type="checkbox"/> 5 |
| Citizen or Subject of a Foreign Country | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> 3 | Foreign Nation | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 | <input type="checkbox"/> 6 |

IV. NATURE OF SUIT (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

Click here for: [Nature of Suit Code Descriptions.](#)

| CONTRACT | TORTS | FORFEITURE/PENALTY | BANKRUPTCY | OTHER STATUTES | |
|---|--|--|---|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 110 Insurance <input type="checkbox"/> 120 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 130 Miller Act <input type="checkbox"/> 140 Negotiable Instrument <input type="checkbox"/> 150 Recovery of Overpayment & Enforcement of Judgment <input type="checkbox"/> 151 Medicare Act <input type="checkbox"/> 152 Recovery of Defaulted Student Loans (Excludes Veterans) <input type="checkbox"/> 153 Recovery of Overpayment of Veteran's Benefits <input type="checkbox"/> 160 Stockholders' Suits <input type="checkbox"/> 190 Other Contract <input type="checkbox"/> 195 Contract Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 196 Franchise | PERSONAL INJURY <input type="checkbox"/> 310 Airplane <input type="checkbox"/> 315 Airplane Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 320 Assault, Libel & Slander <input type="checkbox"/> 330 Federal Employers' Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 340 Marine <input type="checkbox"/> 345 Marine Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 350 Motor Vehicle <input type="checkbox"/> 355 Motor Vehicle Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 360 Other Personal Injury <input type="checkbox"/> 362 Personal Injury - Medical Malpractice | <input type="checkbox"/> 365 Personal Injury - Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 367 Health Care/Pharmaceutical Personal Injury Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 368 Asbestos Personal Injury Product Liability PERSONAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 370 Other Fraud <input type="checkbox"/> 371 Truth in Lending <input type="checkbox"/> 380 Other Personal Property Damage <input type="checkbox"/> 385 Property Damage Product Liability | <input type="checkbox"/> 625 Drug Related Seizure of Property 21 USC 881 <input type="checkbox"/> 690 Other LABOR <input type="checkbox"/> 710 Fair Labor Standards Act <input type="checkbox"/> 720 Labor Management Relations <input type="checkbox"/> 740 Railway Labor Act <input type="checkbox"/> 751 Family and Medical Leave Act <input type="checkbox"/> 790 Other Labor Litigation <input type="checkbox"/> 791 Employee Retirement Income Security Act IMMIGRATION <input type="checkbox"/> 462 Naturalization Application <input type="checkbox"/> 465 Other Immigration Actions | <input type="checkbox"/> 422 Appeal 28 USC 158 <input type="checkbox"/> 423 Withdrawal 28 USC 157 PROPERTY RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 820 Copyrights <input type="checkbox"/> 830 Patent <input type="checkbox"/> 835 Patent - Abbreviated New Drug Application <input type="checkbox"/> 840 Trademark <input type="checkbox"/> 880 Defend Trade Secrets Act of 2016 SOCIAL SECURITY <input type="checkbox"/> 861 HIA (1395ff) <input type="checkbox"/> 862 Black Lung (923) <input type="checkbox"/> 863 DIWC/DIWW (405(g)) <input type="checkbox"/> 864 SSID Title XVI <input type="checkbox"/> 865 RSI (405(g)) FEDERAL TAX SUITS <input type="checkbox"/> 870 Taxes (U.S. Plaintiff or Defendant) <input type="checkbox"/> 871 IRS—Third Party 26 USC 7609 | <input type="checkbox"/> 375 False Claims Act <input type="checkbox"/> 376 Qui Tam (31 USC 3729(a)) <input type="checkbox"/> 400 State Reapportionment <input type="checkbox"/> 410 Antitrust <input type="checkbox"/> 430 Banks and Banking <input type="checkbox"/> 450 Commerce <input type="checkbox"/> 460 Deportation <input type="checkbox"/> 470 Racketeer Influenced and Corrupt Organizations <input type="checkbox"/> 480 Consumer Credit (15 USC 1681 or 1692) <input type="checkbox"/> 485 Telephone Consumer Protection Act <input type="checkbox"/> 490 Cable/Sat TV <input type="checkbox"/> 850 Securities/Commodities/Exchange <input type="checkbox"/> 890 Other Statutory Actions <input type="checkbox"/> 891 Agricultural Acts <input type="checkbox"/> 893 Environmental Matters <input type="checkbox"/> 895 Freedom of Information Act <input type="checkbox"/> 896 Arbitration <input type="checkbox"/> 899 Administrative Procedure Act/Review or Appeal of Agency Decision <input type="checkbox"/> 950 Constitutionality of State Statutes |
| REAL PROPERTY <input type="checkbox"/> 210 Land Condemnation <input type="checkbox"/> 220 Foreclosure <input type="checkbox"/> 230 Rent Lease & Ejectment <input type="checkbox"/> 240 Torts to Land <input type="checkbox"/> 245 Tort Product Liability <input type="checkbox"/> 290 All Other Real Property | CIVIL RIGHTS <input type="checkbox"/> 440 Other Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 441 Voting <input type="checkbox"/> 442 Employment <input type="checkbox"/> 443 Housing/Accommodations <input type="checkbox"/> 445 Amer. w/Disabilities - Employment <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 446 Amer. w/Disabilities - Other <input type="checkbox"/> 448 Education | PRISONER PETITIONS Habeas Corpus: <input type="checkbox"/> 463 Alien Detainee <input type="checkbox"/> 510 Motions to Vacate Sentence <input type="checkbox"/> 530 General <input type="checkbox"/> 535 Death Penalty Other: <input type="checkbox"/> 540 Mandamus & Other <input type="checkbox"/> 550 Civil Rights <input type="checkbox"/> 555 Prison Condition <input type="checkbox"/> 560 Civil Detainee - Conditions of Confinement | | | |

V. ORIGIN (Place an "X" in One Box Only)

- ☒ 1 Original Proceeding
- ☐ 2 Removed from State Court
- ☐ 3 Remanded from Appellate Court
- ☐ 4 Reinstated or Reopened
- ☐ 5 Transferred from Another District (specify)
- ☐ 6 Multidistrict Litigation - Transfer
- ☐ 8 Multidistrict Litigation - Direct File

VI. CAUSE OF ACTION

Cite the U.S. Civil Statute under which you are filing (Do not cite jurisdictional statutes unless diversity):

Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act

Brief description of cause:

VII. REQUESTED IN COMPLAINT:

☒ CHECK IF THIS IS A CLASS ACTION UNDER RULE 23, F.R.Cv.P.

DEMAND \$

CHECK YES only if demanded in complaint:

JURY DEMAND: ☒ Yes ☐ No

VIII. RELATED CASE(S) IF ANY

(See instructions):

JUDGE

DOCKET NUMBER

DATE

04/26/2023

SIGNATURE OF ATTORNEY OF RECORD

/s/ David S. Glanzberg

FOR OFFICE USE ONLY

RECEIPT # _____ AMOUNT _____ APPLYING IFP _____ JUDGE _____ MAG. JUDGE _____

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

CASE #:

JOHN MAHONEY,
on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated.

Plaintiffs,

**CLASS ACTION COMPLAINT
FOR INJUNCTIVE AND
DECLARATIVE RELIEF**

v.

FOOT LOCKER STORES, INC

Defendant.
-----X

INTRODUCTION

1. John Mahoney, who is legally blind, and on behalf of himself and others similarly situated, asserts the following claims against Defendant known as FOOT LOCKER STORES, INC, operating as FOOT LOCKER, (henceforth known as FOOT LOCKER) as follows. Defendant denies full and equal access to its Website.
1. Based on a 2010 U.S. Census Bureau report, approximately 8.1 million people in the United States are visually impaired, including 2.1 million who are blind, and according to the American Foundation for the Blind's 2016 report, approximately 300,000 visually impaired persons live in the State of Pennsylvania.
2. "Being unable to access website puts individuals at a great disadvantage in today's society, which is driven by a dynamic electronic marketplace and unprecedented access

to information." U.S. Dep't of Justice, Statement of Eve L. Hill before the Senate Comm. on Health, Educ., Labor & Pensions, at 3 (May 14, 2013).

3. Plaintiff is a blind, visually impaired handicapped person and a member of a protected class of individuals under the ADA, under 42 U.S.C. § 12102(1)-(2), and the regulations implementing the ADA set forth at 28 CFR §§ 36.101 *et seq.*
4. Plaintiff requires screen-reading software to read website content using his computer. Plaintiff uses the terms "blind" or "visually-impaired" to refer to all people with visual impairments who meet the legal definition of blindness in that they have a visual acuity with correction of less than or equal to 20 x 200.
5. Plaintiff brings this civil rights action against Defendant to enforce Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.* ("Title III"), which requires, among other things, that an owner and operator of a place of public accommodation (1) not deny persons with disabilities the benefits of its services, facilities, privileges and advantages; (2) provide such persons with benefits that are equal to those provided to nondisabled persons; (3) provide auxiliary aids and services-including electronic services for use with a computer screen reading program-where necessary to ensure effective communication with individuals with a visual disability, and to ensure that such persons are not excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than sighted individuals; and (4) utilize administrative methods, practices, and policies that provide persons with disabilities equal access to online content.

6. By failing to make its Website available in a manner compatible with computer screen reader programs, FOOT LOCKER a private entity (as that term is defined in 42 USCS § 12181(6)) who owns and operates places of public accommodation subject to Title III), deprives blind and visually-impaired individuals the benefits of its goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of its places of public accommodation-all benefits it affords nondisabled individuals- thereby increasing the sense of isolation and stigma among these Americans that Title III was meant to redress.
7. Upon information and belief, because FOOT LOCKER, [WWW.FOOT LOCKER.COM](http://WWW.FOOTLOCKER.COM) (the "Website"), which provides information necessary to access its places of public accommodation, has never been accessible and because FOOT LOCKER does not have, and has never had, an adequate corporate policy that is reasonably calculated to cause its Website to become and remain accessible, Plaintiff invokes 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2) and seeks a permanent injunction requiring:
 - a. that FOOT LOCKER retains a qualified consultant acceptable to Plaintiff ("Mutually Agreed Upon Consultant") who shall assist it in improving the accessibility of its Website so the information necessary to access the goods and services offered at its places of public accommodation may be equally accessed and enjoyed by individuals with vision related disabilities;
 - b. that FOOT LOCKER work with the Mutually Agreed Upon Consultant to ensure FOOT LOCKER'S that all employees involved in website development and content development be given web accessibility training on a periodic basis, including onsite training to create accessible

content at the design and development stages;

- c. that FOOT LOCKER work with the Mutually Agreed Upon Consultant to perform an automated accessibility audit on a periodic basis to evaluate whether Website, and thereby its place of public accommodation, may be equally accessed and enjoyed by individuals with vision related disabilities on an ongoing basis;
 - d. that FOOT LOCKER's work with the Mutually Agreed Upon Consultant to perform end-user accessibility/usability testing on a periodic basis with said testing to be performed by individuals with various disabilities to evaluate whether FOOT LOCKER 'S website, and thereby its places of public accommodation, may be equally accessed and enjoyed by individuals with vision related disabilities on an ongoing basis;
 - e. that FOOT LOCKER'S work with the Mutually Agreed Upon Consultant to create an accessibility policy that will be posted on its Website, along with an e-mail address and tollfree phone number to report accessibility-related problems; and
 - f. that Plaintiff, their counsel and its experts monitor Defendant's Website for up to two years after the Mutually Agreed Upon Consultant validates it is free of accessibility errors/violations to ensure FOOT LOCKER has adopted and implemented adequate accessibility policies.
8. Defendant's Website is heavily integrated with the buildings its owns, leases and manages, serving as a gateway to them. Through the Website, Defendant's customers are, inter alia, able to: learn information about each store's location, hours of operation, store specific sales and clearance items, loyalty programs and other unique services offered to customers through its' website.
9. It is, upon information and belief, Defendant's policy and practice to deny Plaintiff Mahoney and other blind or visually impaired users access to its Website, thereby denying the facilities and services that are offered and integrated with its retail

locations. Due to its failure and refusal to remove access barriers to its Website, Plaintiff Mahoney and visually impaired persons have been and are still being denied equal access to Defendant's retail locations and numerous facilities, goods, services and benefits offered to the public through its Website.

10. Web-based technologies have features and content that are modified on a daily, and in some instances, an hourly, basis, and a one time "fix" to an inaccessible website will not cause the website to remain accessible without a corresponding change in corporate policies related to those web-based technologies. To evaluate whether an inaccessible website has been rendered accessible, and whether corporate policies related to web-based technologies have been changed in a meaningful manner that will cause the website to remain accessible, the website must be reviewed on a periodic basis using both automated accessibility screening tools and end user testing by disabled individuals.

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

11. This Court has subject-matter jurisdiction over this action under 28 U.S.C. § 1331 and 42 U.S.C. § 12188.
12. FOOT LOCKER purposefully targets and otherwise solicits business from Pennsylvania residents through its Website, and otherwise frequently conducts business with Pennsylvania residents.
13. Venue in this District is proper under 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b)(2) because this is the judicial district in which a substantial part of the acts and omissions giving rise to

Plaintiff claims occurred.

14. This Court is empowered to issue a declaratory judgment under 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

PARTIES

15. Plaintiff, at all relevant times, is and was a resident of Warminster, Pennsylvania.
16. Defendant is and was at all relevant times a Delaware corporation doing business in Pennsylvania, including its locations in Bucks County, PA.
17. Defendant owns and operates retail locations in the State of Pennsylvania (the: "Physical Locations") that are places of public accommodation within the definition of Title III of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12181(7).

NATURE OF ACTION

18. The Internet has become a significant source of information, a portal, and a tool for conducting business, doing everyday activities such as shopping, learning, banking, researching, as well as many other activities for sighted, blind and visually impaired persons alike. Plaintiff Mahoney cannot use a computer without the assistance of screen-reading software. He is, however, a proficient screen reader user and uses it to access the internet. He has visited the Website on separate occasions using screen-reading software.
19. The COVID-19 pandemic has shifted the world into an almost entirely online-model.

Entertainment venues are delivering performances to audiences via their Websites or other online streaming services. Our Educational institutions, including private schools and Universities have shifted to a virtual classroom with distance-learning being a new normal option. Furthermore, with store closures or capacity limitations, supply chain breakdowns and uncertain inventory availability, retail stores are relying on their Websites to serve as the fundamental point of contact between their business and consumers. In order for blind and visually impaired consumers to access these Websites, they must use screen-reading software.

20. In today's tech-savvy world, blind and visually impaired people have the ability to access website using keyboards in conjunction with screen access software that vocalizes the visual information found on a computer screen or displays the content on a refreshable Braille display. This technology is known as screen-reading software. Screen-reading software is currently the only method a blind or visually impaired person may independently access the internet. Unless websites are designed to be read by screen-reading software, blind and visually impaired persons are unable to fully access the website, and the information, products, and goods offered thereon.
21. Blind and visually impaired users of Windows operating system-enabled computers and devices have several screen reading software programs available to them. Some of these programs are available for purchase and other programs are available without the user having to purchase the program separately. Job Access With Speech, otherwise known as "JAWS" is currently the most popular, separately purchased and downloaded screen-

reading software program available for a Windows computer. Another popular screen-reading software program is NonVisual Desktop Access "NVDA." Plaintiff uses the former.

22. For screen-reading software to function, the information on a website must be capable of being rendered into text. If the website content is not capable of being rendered into text, the visually impaired user is unable to access the same content available to sighted users.
23. Defendant's Website is riddled with blind areas and blind spots that are without explanation. The lack of audio description renders the Website inaccessible for Plaintiff and all others of similar disposition.
24. The international website standards organization, the World Wide Web Consortium, known throughout the world as W3C, has published version 2.1 of the Web Content Accessibility Guidelines ("WCAG 2.1"). WCAG 2.1 are well-established guidelines for making websites accessible to blind and visually impaired people. These guidelines are universally followed by most large business entities and government agencies to ensure their website are accessible.
25. Plaintiff Mahoney was denied full and equal access to the facilities and services Defendant offers to the public on its Website because he encountered multiple accessibility barriers that visually impaired people often encounter with non-compliant websites:
 - a. A text equivalent for every non-text element is not provided;
 - b. Title frames with text are not provided for identification and navigation;

- c. Equivalent text is not provided when using scripts;
- d. Forms with the same information and functionality as for sighted persons are not provided;
- e. Information about the meaning and structure of content is not conveyed by more than the visual presentation of content;
- f. Text cannot be resized without assistive technology up to 200% without losing content or functionality;
- g. If the content enforces a time limit, the user is not able to extend, adjust or disable it;
- h. Web pages do not have titles that describe the topic or purpose;
- i. The purpose of each link cannot be determined from the link text alone or from the link text and its programmatically determined link context;
- j. One or more keyboard operable user interface lacks a mode of operation where the keyboard focus indicator is discernible;
- k. The default human language of each web page cannot be programmatically determined;
- l. When a component receives focus, it may initiate a change in context;
- m. Changing the setting of a user interface component may automatically cause a change of context where the user has not been advised before using the component;

- n. Labels or instructions are not provided when content requires user input, which include captcha prompts that require the user to verify that he or she is not a robot;
- o. In content, which is implemented by using markup languages, elements do not have complete start and end tags, elements are not nested according to their specifications, elements may contain duplicate attributes, and/or any IDs are not unique;
- p. Inaccessible Portable Document Format (PDFs); and,
- q. The name and role of all User Interface elements cannot be programmatically determined; items that can be set by the user cannot be programmatically set; and/or notification of changes to these items is not available to user agents, including assistive technology.

STATEMENT OF FACTS

26. Defendant is a retail business that owns and operates physical retail locations in Pennsylvania, which offers unique items, weekly sales “Score of the Week” and services, such as “FLX Members”, “House of Hoops” and the “Fan Shop”. Defendant also owns and operates the Website. Plaintiff depends upon the Website to plan his trips, to purchase gift cards, military benefits information, inventory availability and other options denied to Plaintiff Mahoney. Plaintiff is being denied access to Defendant’s Physical Location by way of Access Barriers on it’s Website. Until such Access Barriers are removed (i.e., until the Website is made accessible to the visually impaired), Plaintiff

cannot reasonably intend to visit Defendant's Physical Location. Any specific allegations as to when, why or how the Plaintiff would visit the Defendant's Physical Location would be futile, as Plaintiff is unaware of if and when the Defendant will make its Website fully accessible.

27. Defendants' Website is heavily integrated with its brick and mortar locations. Defendant uses the Physical Locations to offer numerous services to the public, including, without limitation, weekly sales, gift card purchases, inventory availability, learn about accessories, learn about Defendants' loyalty and club programs, customer reviews, new product placement, shipping and return policy, etc. The Plaintiff, an elderly, blind veteran would benefit from the information on the Website to guide his own and his grandchildren's sports and sneaker needs. Plaintiffs' injury stems from not being able to view, discover or enjoy the potential benefits and services as individuals without his physical disability.
28. Defendant's Website offers information to consumers throughout the United States, including Pennsylvania. Such information (the "Information") includes, without limitation, information necessary to access and visit the Physical Locations, such as, without limitation, the phone number to the Physical Location, directions to, availability of parking and accessibility of the Physical Location, and information regarding the various offerings at the Physical Locations.
29. Plaintiff is a visually impaired and legally blind person, who cannot use a computer without the assistance of screen-reading software. Plaintiff is, however, a proficient

JAWS and/or NVDA screen-reader user and uses it to access the Internet.

30. Plaintiff has attempted to use Defendant's Website at least once in the past in order to access the Information and services presented thereon in order to access and visit the Physical Locations. Unfortunately, because of FOOT LOCKER 'S failure to build its Website in a manner that is compatible with screen reader programs, Plaintiff is unable to understand, and thus is denied the benefit of, much of the content and services he wishes to access or use. For example:

- a. Many features on the Website lacks alt. text, which is the invisible code embedded beneath a graphical image. As a result, Plaintiff was unable to differentiate what products were on the screen due to the failure of the Website to adequately describe its content.
- b. Many features on the Website also fail to Add a label element or title attribute for each field. This is a problem for the visually impaired because the screen reader fails to communicate the purpose of the page element. It also leads to the user not being able to understand what he or she is expected to insert into the subject field.
- c. The Website also contains a host of broken links, which is a hyperlink to a non- existent or empty webpage. For the visually impaired this is especially paralyzing due to the inability to

navigate or otherwise determine where one is on the website once a broken link is encountered.

31. As a result of visiting FOOT LOCKER'S Website and from investigations performed on his behalf, Plaintiff is aware the Website includes at least the following additional barriers blocking his full and equal use:
- a. The Website does not provide a text equivalent for every non-text element;
 - b. The purpose of each link cannot be determined from the link text alone or from the link text and its programmatically determined link context;
 - c. Web pages lack titles that describe their topic or purpose;
 - d. Headings and labels do not describe topic or purpose;
 - e. Keyboard user interfaces lack a mode of operation where the keyboard focus indicator is visible;
 - f. The default human language of each web page cannot be programmatically determined;
 - g. The human language of each passage or phrase in the content cannot be programmatically determined;
 - h. Labels or instructions are not always provided when content requires user input;

- i. Text cannot be resized up to 200 percent without assistive technology so that it may still be viewed without loss of content or functionality;
- J. A mechanism is not always available to bypass blocks of content that are repeated on multiple web pages;
- k. A correct reading sequence is not provided on pages where the sequence in which content is presented affects its meaning;
- l. In content implemented using markup languages, elements do not always have complete start and end tags, are not nested according to their specifications, may contain duplicate attributes, and IDs are not always unique; and
- m. The name and role of all UI elements cannot be programmatically determined; things that can be set by the user cannot be programmatically set; and/or notification of changes to these items is not available to user agents, including assistive technology.

Defendant Must Remove Barriers to its Website

32. These barriers, and others, deny Plaintiff full and equal access to the Information and content the Website offers related to the Physical Locations, and now deter him from attempting to use the Website and/or visit the Physical Locations. Still, Plaintiff would like to, and intends to, access the Website to gather the Information and access the content and services presented thereon in order to visit one or any of the Physical Locations as soon as the Website is made accessible to the visually impaired, or to test

the Website for compliance with the ADA.

33. Plaintiff requires access to the Website in order to gather the Information for purposes of accessing the services that Defendant offers to the public by way of the Physical Locations. Plaintiff intends to do so, and to visit the Physical Locations to take advantage of the services and products offered there, as soon as the Website is made accessible to the visually impaired.
34. Due to Defendant's failure and refusal to remove access barriers to its Website, Plaintiff and visually impaired persons have been and are still being denied equal access to Defendant's Website and the Physical Locations, and the numerous goods and services and benefits offered to the public through the Physical Locations.
35. If the Website were accessible, i.e. if FOOT LOCKER removed the access barriers described therein, Plaintiff could independently research the Website's Information, content and services presented thereon related to the Physical Locations.
36. Through his attempts to use the Website, Plaintiff has actual knowledge of the access barriers that make the Information, content and services presented thereon inaccessible and independently unusable by blind and visually impaired people.
37. Though FOOT LOCKER may have centralized policies regarding the maintenance and operation of its Website, upon and information and belief, FOOT LOCKER has never had a plan or policy that is reasonably calculated to make its Website fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals with vision related disabilities. As a result, the complained of access barriers are permanent in nature and likely to persist.

38. The Law requires that FOOT LOCKER reasonably accommodate Plaintiff's disabilities by removing these existing access barriers. Removal of the barriers identified above is readily achievable and may be earned out without much difficulty or expense.
39. Plaintiff's above request for injunctive relief is consistent with the work performed by the United States Department of Justice, Department of Transportation, and U.S. Architectural and Transportation Barriers Compliance Board (the "Access Board"), all of whom have relied upon or mandated that the public-facing pages of website complies with the international compliance standard known as Web Content Accessibility Guidelines version 2.1 AA ("WCAG 2.1 AA"), which is published by an independent third party known as the Worldwide Web Consortium ("W3C").
40. Plaintiff and the Class (as defined below) have been, and in the absence of an injunction will continue to be, injured by FOOT LOCKER's failure to provide its online content and services related to its places of public accommodation in a manner that is compatible with screen reader technology.
41. FOOT LOCKER has long known that screen reader technology is necessary for individuals with visual disabilities to access its online content and services, and that it is legally responsible for providing the same in a manner that is compatible with these auxiliary aids.
42. Indeed, the Disability Rights Section of the DOJ reaffirmed in a 2015 Statement of Interest before the United States District Court for the District of Massachusetts that

it has been a "longstanding position" of the Department of Justice "that the ADA applies to website of public accommodations." See *National Association of the Deaf, Massachusetts Institute of Technology*, No. 3:15-cv-300024-MGM, DOJ Statement of Interest in Opp. To Motion to Dismiss or Stay, Doc. 34, p. 4 (D. Mass. Jun. 25, 2015) ("MIT Statement of Interest"); see also *National Association of the Deaf v. Harvard University*, No. 3:15-cv-30023 - MGM, DOJ Statement of Interest of the United States of America, Doc. 33, p.4 (D. Mass. Jun. 25, 2015) ("Harvard Statement of Interest").

43. The ADA expressly contemplates the injunctive relief that Plaintiff seeks in this action. In relevant part, the ADA requires:

In the case of violations of ... this title, injunctive relief shall include an order to alter facilities to make such facilities readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities ... Where appropriate, injunctive relief shall also include requiring the ... modification of a policy ... 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2).

44. There is no DOJ administrative proceeding that could provide Plaintiff with Title III injunctive relief.
45. While DOJ has rulemaking authority and can bring enforcement actions in court; Congress has not authorized it to provide an adjudicative administrative process to provide Plaintiff with relief.
46. Plaintiff alleges violations of existing and longstanding statutory and regulatory requirements to provide auxiliary aids or services necessary to ensure effective communication, and courts routinely decide these types of matters.

47. Resolution of Plaintiffs claims does not require the Court to unravel intricate, technical facts, but rather involves consideration of facts within the conventional competence of the courts, e.g. (a) whether FOOT LOCKER offers content necessary to access it and services on its Website and places of public accommodation, and (b) whether Plaintiff can access such content and services.
48. Without injunctive relief, Plaintiff and other visually impaired consumers will continue to be unable to independently use the Website and the content and services presented thereon necessary to access its places of public accommodation, violating their rights.

CLASS ACTION ALLEGATIONS

49. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated, seeks to certify a nationwide class (the "Class") under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) and 23(b)(2) consisting of all legally blind individuals in the United States who have attempted to access Defendant's Website and as a result have been denied access to the equal enjoyment of the goods and services offered at its places of public accommodation, during the relevant statutory period.
50. Common questions of law and fact exist amongst the Class, including:

- a. Whether the Physical Locations are a "public accommodation" under the ADA;
 - b. Whether, by providing content and services related to the Physical Locations including, without limitation, the Information, Defendant's Website bears a sufficient "nexus" to the Physical Locations;
 - c. Whether, through Defendant's Website, Defendant denies the full and equal enjoyment of its products, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to people with visual disabilities, violating the ADA.
51. Plaintiff's claims are typical of the Class. The Class, like Plaintiff, are visually impaired or otherwise blind, and claim that Defendant has violated the ADA by failing to remove access barriers on its Website so as to be independently accessible to the Class.
52. Plaintiff will fairly and adequately represent and protect the interests of the members of the Class (the "Class Members") because Plaintiff has retained and is represented by counsel competent and experienced in complex class action litigation, and because Plaintiff has no interests antagonistic to the Class Members.
53. Class certification of the claims is appropriate under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(2) because Defendant has acted or refused to act on grounds generally applicable to the Class, making appropriate both declaratory and injunctive relief with respect to the Class as a whole.
54. Alternatively, class certification is appropriate under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(b)(3) because fact and legal questions common to Class Members predominate over questions affecting only individual Class Members, and because a class action is superior to other

available methods for the fair and efficient adjudication of this litigation.

55. Judicial economy will be served by maintaining this lawsuit as a class action in that it is likely to avoid the burden that would be otherwise placed upon the judicial system by the filing of numerous similar suits throughout the United States.

FIRST CAUSE OF ACTION
VIOLATIONS OF THE ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq.

Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class Members, repeats and realleges every allegation of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.

56. Section 302(a) of Title III of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12101 et seq., provides:

No individual shall be discriminated against on the basis of disability in the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of any place of public accommodation by any person who owns, leases (or leases to), or operates a place of public accommodation. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(a).

57. The Physical Locations, owned and operated by Defendant, are public accommodations within the definition of Title III of the ADA, 42 U.S.C. § 12181(7)..
58. The Website bears a direct nexus to the Physical Location, as it offers content, services and information (including, without limitation, the Information) to the general public necessary to access the Physical Locations, and as such, must be equally accessible to all potential consumers.
59. By failing to make the Website equally accessible to all potential consumers (including members of the general public that are visually impaired), Defendant has prevented Plaintiff from availing himself of the goods and services that Defendant offers at the

Physical Location.

60. Had Plaintiff been able to access the content, services and information (including, without limitation, the Information) offered on the Website, Plaintiff would have availed himself of the goods and services that Defendant offers at the Physical Location.
61. Under Section 302(b)(1) of Title III of the ADA, it is unlawful discrimination to deny individuals with disabilities the opportunity to participate in or benefit from the products, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations of an entity. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(A)(i).
62. Under Section 302(b)(1) of Title III of the ADA, it is unlawful discrimination to deny individuals with disabilities an opportunity to participate in or benefit from the products, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodation, which is equal to the opportunities afforded to other individuals. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(1)(A)(ii).
63. Under Section 302(b)(2) of Title III of the ADA, unlawful discrimination also includes, among other things:

[A] failure to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices, or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages, or accommodations to individuals with disabilities, unless the entity can demonstrate that making such modifications would fundamentally alter the nature of such goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations; and a failure to take such steps as may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services, unless the entity can demonstrate that taking such steps would fundamentally alter the nature of the good, service, facility, privilege, advantage, or accommodation being offered or would result in an undue burden. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(ii)-(iii.)
64. The acts alleged herein constitute violations of Title III of the ADA, and the

regulations promulgated thereunder. Plaintiff, who is a member of a protected class of persons under the ADA, has a physical disability that substantially limits the major life activity of sight within the meaning of 42 U.S.C. § 12102(1)(A)-(2)(A). Furthermore, Plaintiff has been denied full and equal access to the Website and Defendant's places of public accommodation, has not been provided services that are provided to other patrons who are not disabled, and has not been provided any reasonable accommodation to those services. Defendant has failed to take any prompt and equitable steps to remedy its discriminatory conduct. These violations are ongoing.

65. Under 42 U.S.C. § 12188 and the remedies, procedures, and rights set forth and incorporated therein, Plaintiff, requests relief as set forth below.

SECOND CAUSE OF ACTION
DECLARATORY RELIEF

66. Plaintiff, on behalf of himself and the Class Members, repeats and realleges every allegation of the preceding paragraphs as if fully set forth herein.
67. An actual controversy has arisen and now exists between the parties in that Plaintiff contends, and is informed and believes that Defendant denies, that its Website contains access barriers denying blind customers the full and equal access to the products, services and facilities of its places of public accommodation, which Defendant owns, operations and controls, and therefore fails to comply with

applicable laws including, but not limited to, Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12182, *et seq.* prohibiting discrimination against the blind.

68. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate at this time in order that each of the parties may know their respective rights and duties and act accordingly.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff respectfully requests this Court grant the following relief:

69. A Declaratory Judgment that at the commencement of this action **D**was in violation of the specific requirements of Title III of the ADA described above, and the relevant implementing regulations of the ADA, in that **D**took no action that was reasonably calculated to ensure that its Website is fully accessible to, and independently usable by, individuals with visual disabilities;
70. A permanent injunction pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a)(2) and 28 CFR § 36.504(a) which directs Defendant to take all steps necessary to bring its Website into full compliance with the requirements related to and set forth in the ADA, and its implementing regulations, so that its Website and its places of public accommodation is fully accessible to, and independently usable by, blind individuals, and which further directs that the Court shall retain jurisdiction for a period to be determined to ensure that Defendant has adopted and is following an institutional policy that will in fact cause it to remain fully in compliance with the law- the specific injunctive relief requested by Plaintiff is described more fully in paragraph 8 above;

71. An award of costs and expenses of this action;
72. Payment of reasonable attorneys' fees, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205 and 28 CFR § 36.505, including costs of monitoring Defendant's compliance with the judgment (see *Hadix v. Johnson*, 143 F.3d 246 (6th Cir. 1998), *aff'd in part, rev'd in part*, 527 U.S. 343 (1999); *Jenkins v. Missouri*, 127 F.3d 709 (8th Cir. 1997); *Walker v. US. Dep't of Hous. & Urban Dev.*, 99 F.3d 761 (5th Cir. 1996); *Stewart v. Gates*, 987 F.2d 1450, 1452 (9th Cir. 1993) (district court should permit compensation for the post judgment monitoring efforts by the plaintiff's counsel that are "useful and necessary to ensure compliance with the court's orders"); *Garrity v. Sununu*, 752 F.2d 727, 738-39 (1st Cir. 1984); *Adams v. Mathis*, 752 F.2d 553 (11th Cir. 1985); *Willie M. v. Hunt*, 732 F.2d 383, 385, 387 (4th Cir. 1984); *Bond v. Stanton*, 630 F.2d 1231, 1233-34 (7th Cir. 1980); *Northcross v. Board of Educ.*, 611 F.2d 624, 637 (6th Cir. 1979) ("Services devoted to reasonable monitoring of the court's decrees, both to ensure full compliance and to ensure that the plan is indeed working.. are essential to the long-term success of the plaintiffs suit.") (citing 3rd Circuit's support for District Court's award of prospective fees to plaintiffs counsel);
73. An order certifying the Class under Fed. R. Civ. P. 23(a) & (b)(2) and/or (b)(3), appointing Plaintiff as Class Representative, and his attorneys as Class Counsel; and
74. Such other and further relief as this Court deems just and proper.

DEMAND FOR TRIAL BY JURY

Pursuant to Fed. R. Civ. P. 38(b), Plaintiff Mahoney demands a trial by jury on all questions of fact the Complaint raises.

Dated: 04/26/2023

Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

GLANZBERG TOBIA LAW, P.C.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Glanzberg', written over a horizontal line.

By: _____
David S. Glanzberg, Esq.

David.Glanzberg@gtlawpc.com

123 South Broad Street, Suite 1640
Philadelphia, PA 19109
Tel: (215) 981-5400
Fax: (267) 319-1993

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFF

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

CASE MANAGEMENT TRACK DESIGNATION FORM

| | | |
|--|-----------------------|--|
| JOHN MAHONEY, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated v. | : : : : : | CIVIL ACTION NO. |
| FOOT LOCKER STORES, INC. | : | |

In accordance with the Civil Justice Expense and Delay Reduction Plan of this court, counsel for plaintiff shall complete a Case Management Track Designation Form in all civil cases at the time of filing the complaint and serve a copy on all defendants. (See § 1:03 of the plan set forth on the reverse side of this form.) In the event that a defendant does not agree with the plaintiff regarding said designation, that defendant shall, with its first appearance, submit to the clerk of court and serve on the plaintiff and all other parties, a Case Management Track Designation Form specifying the track to which that defendant believes the case should be assigned.

SELECT ONE OF THE FOLLOWING CASE MANAGEMENT TRACKS:

- (a) Habeas Corpus – Cases brought under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 through § 2255. ()
- (b) Social Security – Cases requesting review of a decision of the Secretary of Health and Human Services denying plaintiff Social Security Benefits. ()
- (c) Arbitration – Cases required to be designated for arbitration under Local Civil Rule 53.2. ()
- (d) Asbestos – Cases involving claims for personal injury or property damage from exposure to asbestos. ()

(e) Special Management – Cases that do not fall into tracks (a) through (d) that are commonly referred to as complex and that need special or intense management by the court.

(See reverse side of this form for a detailed explanation of special management cases.) ()

(f) Standard Management – Cases that do not fall into any one of the other tracks. (✓)



Date 04/26/23

DAVID S. GLANZBERG, ESQ.
Attorney for JOHN MAHONEY

Telephone 215-981-5400
E-Mail Address

FAX Number 267-319-1993
DAVID.GLANZBERG@GTLAWPC.COM

DESIGNATION FORM

(to be used by counsel or pro se plaintiff to indicate the category of the case for the purpose of assignment to the appropriate calendar)

Address of Plaintiff: 7203 CENTENNIAL STATION, WARMINSTER, PA 18974
 Address of Defendant: 2500 MORELAND ROAD, #3065, WILLOW GROVE, PA 19090
 Place of Accident, Incident or Transaction: BUCKS COUNTY


RELATED CASE, IF ANY:

Case Number: _____ Judge: _____ Date Terminated: _____

Civil cases are deemed related when **Yes** is answered to any of the following questions:

- | | | |
|--|------------------------------|--|
| 1. Is this case related to property included in an earlier numbered suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Does this case involve the same issue of fact or grow out of the same transaction as a prior suit pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Does this case involve the validity or infringement of a patent already in suit or any earlier numbered case pending or within one year previously terminated action of this court? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Is this case a second or successive habeas corpus, social security appeal, or pro se civil rights case filed by the same individual? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

I certify that, to my knowledge, the within case ☐ is / ☒ **is not** related to any case now pending or within one year previously terminated action in this court except as noted above.

DATE: 04/26/2023  50820
 Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)

CIVIL: (Place a ✓ in one category only)

A. Federal Question Cases:

- ☐ 1. Indemnity Contract, Marine Contract, and All Other Contracts
- ☐ 2. FELA
- ☐ 3. Jones Act-Personal Injury
- ☐ 4. Antitrust
- ☐ 5. Patent
- ☐ 6. Labor-Management Relations
- ☐ 7. Civil Rights
- ☐ 8. Habeas Corpus
- ☐ 9. Securities Act(s) Cases
- ☐ 10. Social Security Review Cases
- ☒ 11. All other Federal Question Cases
 (Please specify): Americans with Disabilities Act (446)

B. Diversity Jurisdiction Cases:

- ☐ 1. Insurance Contract and Other Contracts
- ☐ 2. Airplane Personal Injury
- ☐ 3. Assault, Defamation
- ☐ 4. Marine Personal Injury
- ☐ 5. Motor Vehicle Personal Injury
- ☐ 6. Other Personal Injury (Please specify): _____
- ☐ 7. Products Liability
- ☐ 8. Products Liability – Asbestos
- ☐ 9. All other Diversity Cases
 (Please specify): _____

ARBITRATION CERTIFICATION

(The effect of this certification is to remove the case from eligibility for arbitration.)

I, David S. Glanzberg, counsel of record or pro se plaintiff, do hereby certify:

- ☐ Pursuant to Local Civil Rule 53.2, § 3(c) (2), that to the best of my knowledge and belief, the damages recoverable in this civil action case exceed the sum of \$150,000.00 exclusive of interest and costs:
- ☒ Relief other than monetary damages is sought.

DATE: 04/26/2023  50820
 Attorney-at-Law / Pro Se Plaintiff Attorney I.D. # (if applicable)

NOTE: A trial de novo will be a trial by jury only if there has been compliance with F.R.C.P. 38.